

LSTA Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes - Tuesday, April 7, 2015
Comfort Inn & Suites, DeForest

Members Present

Rachel Arndt (Milwaukee Public Library), Gus Falkenberg (IFLS), Stacy Fisher (Waunakee High School), Erin Foley (Adams County Public Library), Amanda Hegge (Whitehall Public Library), Nyama Marsh (Whitefish Bay Public Library, Glendale), Eric Norton (McMillan Memorial Library, Wisconsin Rapids), Omar Poler (UW-Madison SLIS), Cherie Sanderson (Boulder Junction Public Library), and Marla Sepnafski (WVLS).

Members Excused

Jennifer Einwalter (Jack Russell Memorial Library, Hartford) and Kristin Stoeger (Brown County Library)

Division Staff Present

Nancy Anderson, Martha Berninger, Ryan Claringbole, John DeBacher, Terrie Howe, Kurt Kiefer, Jamie McCanless, Tessa Michaelson Schmidt, and Denise Anton Wright

Call to Order and Introduction

Howe called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Committee members and staff introduced themselves.

Review of the Agenda

Howe reviewed the agenda for today's meeting.

DLT Administrator's Remarks

Kiefer thanked everyone for being part of this process and stressed the important task of this Committee. The group sitting around this table is a team and team work gets things done. Kurt also asked the assistance of this Committee in nominating folks from the library world for the Agency's annual "Friends of Education" award.

2015 LSTA Budget Review

DeBacher referred to the 2015 spreadsheet that McCanless created. This is the budget that was approved at the Committee meeting last fall (November). We are trying to look at the budget a little differently due to new directives from IMLS on how the program is administered. DeBacher and Howe are attending the national IMLS meeting later this month. The risk assessment that was taken care of at the federal level has now been directed to the states. This won't impact the Committee directly but will change how we as a team assess the applications.

DeBacher referred to the 2015 budget spreadsheet that was being projected in the room so that everyone could see. We refer to internal and external projects and use the terms

competitive and non-competitive. DeBacher discussed these terms and the new distinctions and new terminology that we'll be using. IMLS is requiring a little more reporting from systems (but we were already doing that). DeBacher briefly went through each budget line on the 2015 budget and shared updates on each.

2016 Preliminary Budget Overview

DeBacher referred to the 2016 budget spreadsheet that was being projected in the room so that everyone could see. He briefly explained the "maintenance of effort" (MOE) penalty from the IMLS (reductions to 2011 system funding and the Agency's funding resulting in a \$135,000 reduction in our federal funding). Overall, the federal IMLS budget was higher than anticipated so the negative impact was less than we imagined. Howe briefly discussed the 2016 budget and the categories the Committee will be reviewing: Technology, Special Services, and Library Improvement.

DeBacher mentioned the 10:00 a.m. public hearing. We anticipate having at least two guests for the hearing. President Obama has proposed additional funding / new initiatives for the IMLS budget. The grants to states program (name for the WI DPI funding) has been very important and DeBacher believes the President acknowledges that. The 2016 budget will also reflect the MOE penalty.

Howe referenced two documents in the LSTA Advisory Committee folder (in Google drive) that provide an overview of the LSTA funds. Every five years we need to evaluate our LSTA plans and establish plans for the next five years.

Minutes of November 19, 2014 Meeting

Howe asked for a motion of approval. Norton noticed two items that need to be corrected: 1) he was at the meeting, and 2) Macmillan Memorial Library is the official name for his library. Falkenberg motion / Sepnafski second. Motion carried.

LSTA Coordinator Report – Procedures for Discussion & Information Conflict of Interest Policy

Howe discussed the Committee's Conflict of Interest Policy. Staff / system directors from systems who may benefit from any of the funds must abstain from voting; participating in the discussion is okay. DeBacher used the example of Falkenberg from the Indianhead Federated Library System. Falkenberg could add to the discussion of a system technology grant but he should not vote. Direct impact is the key here.

Howe reported on the IMLS federal grants-to-states program. The recommendation to defund the IMLS budget has been in the news recently. The new Office of Management & Budget guidelines haven't resulted in huge changes but different reporting mechanisms and new ways to track agencies. The OMB guidelines will assure legislators that funds are being properly managed. There is a new reporting system that includes financials. This new reporting system will result in changes to the actual application and forms. DeBacher discussed training options for our Wisconsin library community as a result of the new changes.

Public Hearing

It's 9:45 and Public Hearing is scheduled for 10:00, so we will jump to the next category until 10:00.

Description of Preliminary Grant Categories for 2016 by DLT

Howe & the rest of the PLD and RL3 Team will discuss these.

DPI Positions & Support

Communication and Planning

Howe reported that this category includes costs associated with meetings for the State Librarian (Kurt Kiefer). These include COLAND meetings (meets an average of 6 times per year but recently there have been more meetings) and the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies (COSLA) meetings. The amount is slightly reduced - by \$5,000 - in our recommendation.

PLDT - LSTA Administration

Howe reported that this is limited to no more than 4% of the total grant funds. Kiefer mentioned that the policy and budget staff from both federal and our Agency will be working on this and communicating about it.

RL&LL – Statewide Technology

Berninger reported that this category includes BadgerLink, the WI Digital Archives, BadgerLearn Pro, and the Wisconsin Document Depository program. It covers 9.7 FTE as well as a part-time position for IT support, a portion of Berninger's salary, and a portion of Berninger's assistant director. Norton asked about the funds from last year's budget. Falkenberg asked when these funds were in the state budget. Berninger reported a drop over the last 20 years. When she joined the RL&LL staff in 2006, she said that only a small portion of salaries drew upon state funds.

RL&LL – WISCAT

Berninger reported that this category funds one full time librarian and funding for software that's used for ILL requests. Falkenberg asked about the COLAND statewide discovery layer – what would be its impact on WISCAT? Berninger replied that this is an ongoing discussion. The layer would be helpful but does not take the place of one or several large integrated library systems. Falkenberg asked what about costs? Kiefer suggested that we let the LEAN process do its work regarding cost. DeBacher chimed in regarding what some of the library systems are doing – also efforts in other states. Savings from the vendor may eventually offset any enlarged costs.

PLDT - Statewide Library Improvement

DeBacher reported that this category includes partial funding for his position as well as full funding for McCanless' position. It also includes supplies, travel and expenses for meetings as well as some special studies conducted by the PLD team.

PLDT - Youth & Special Services Consultant & Technology Consultant

Howe reported on this category.

The Committee agreed to take a 5 minute break before the Public Hearing.

10:16 – Public Hearing - Two Presentations:

#1 – Creating a Service Hub for DPLA. Emily Pfotenhauer and Stef Morrill (both from WiLS) on the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA). The document that they will be speaking from can be found on the Google drive. The purpose of this project is to create a DPLA service hub in Wisconsin. This hub would build upon Recollection Wisconsin, would bring in new collections, and would be a collaborative undertaking among WiLS, Wisconsin Historical Society, UW-Madison, UW-Milwaukee, Milwaukee Public Library, and the DPI. They are requesting \$50,000 for 2016; this is the minimum amount needed to support a service hub in Wisconsin during 2016. LSTA funds are a good fit for this project because the project would continue to amplify and support digitization. Outcomes of this project also fit into the state's LSTA priorities. IMLS is also very supportive of DPLA. The existing partnership with the Nicholas Family Foundation (who has supported Recollection Wisconsin) would continue to support this new endeavor.

Foley asked how this project would work with the various libraries and organizations who are putting their digitized collections on the Internet. Pfotenhauer replied that they are already working with those institutions. There can be separate hubs but DPLA would aggregate the resources so they are all findable. Recollection Wisconsin is doing that now but DPLA is a national platform.

Howe asked what the roles would be for the various partners. Pfotenhauer replied that UW-Madison is building a new aggregator and has committed technology resources. The Wisconsin Historical Society and the Milwaukee PL both host content for small institutions. UW-Milwaukee is looking to provide digital services, and WiLS is providing the project management and fiscal agency.

Michaelson-Schmidt asked whether this would replace the current LSTA digital efforts. Morrill replied that this is a complement for local digitization. This project does not pay for a library to have its collection digitized. This project takes local efforts and extends them regionally and nationally.

Marsh asked if this project would include funding for new positions. Morrill replied that WiLS would increase their staff in order to execute the project and would be looking for other sources of funding. The project would not rely on LSTA funding for future years.

Berninger stated that DPLA had been working with the Wisconsin Historical Society on oversight. When did the shift happen so Recollection Wisconsin would oversee? Morrill replied that it made sense to extend what's already happening to a national level.

Kiefer added that a detailed budget would be very helpful in order to consider the sustainability for the project. He had hoped to include this in digital projects funding at that state level but that didn't happen. He asked about procurement issues because the DPI has rules about working with vendors. Morrill replied that with so many partners, the application could come from a partner – not necessarily WiLS.

Michaelson-Schmidt asked if they could talk more about what WiLS does with its partners. Morrill replied that WiLS is in business to work with libraries. They are a separate 501c 3 and among their current projects, they've been working with several public library systems on long range planning.

Falkenberg asked whether we're talking about creating a grant category. Michaelson-Schmidt said yes, this would be a new category and an application would need to be completed. Some of the questions that we're now asking would be clarified through the application process. This would be a project for 2016. Howe reported that the grant category would be a non-competitive process and would be similar to the current situation with Statewide Delivery using LSTA funds.

#2 – Corey Bauman from SCLS - Delivery

Bauman reported that the South Central Library System (SCLS) is looking to continue the relationship for Delivery at the current funding level with LSTA. This has been an extraordinarily helpful relationship. He wanted to report what they do with the money. The grant funding provides physical delivery four days per week. The volume averages 480,000 units per delivery. 630,000 total miles traveled with a 20 vehicle fleet (maintenance is done in-house). SCLS partners with the UW system on delivery and is constantly evaluating their efficiency. They look forward to partnering with the current LEAN system study and to assist in any way possible

Falkenberg asked how their costs compare to third party services. Bauman replied that they contract for northern-most systems. They have not evaluated this recently. Berninger reported that she worked with Bruce Smith a few years ago on this question. There were many more competitive services in the past. Now there are much fewer professional delivery services available. Berninger mentioned at that time the UW System raised concerns about transporting fragile items via third-party services. SCLS delivery has been able to provide the level of quality service that is necessary. Bauman added that the SCLS Delivery service only works with libraries.

DeBacher thanked Bauman for bringing up the System Study. The group included Bruce Smith (former head of the SCLS Delivery service) on purpose. DeBacher said that Bauman will be involved in future work on this. Bauman reported that they are in the first year of a three-year contract with the UW system.

Because there were no other questions, the Public Hearing ended at 10:50 a.m.

Federal Grant Sub-Awards

Delivery Projects

Howe asked Berninger to explain this request. Underwriting for SCLS and Northern Waters. Funding level has not changed for several years.

Library System Technology Projects

Claringbole reported that this is a non-competitive category. These grants provide each regional library system with a set amount. The funds are used by each system in ways they feel they can boost technology within their system. Claringbole has heard that this is a vital category and DeBacher added that these grants pre-date him at the DPI. The category originated during the time when the development of regional shared ILS were taking place. These grants still require an application and encourages new efforts. Kiefer said this a category of funding that could be used for elements of the system LEAN study and he reminded the Committee about the significant funds (4+ million dollars) that the state contributed regarding increased bandwidth.

Serving Special Populations: Accessibility Projects

Serving Special Populations: Literacy Projects

Michaelson-Schmidt reported on both of these long-standing, competitive categories. In recent years these two categories have been growing and expanding. Michaelson-Schmidt asks that these categories continue to be funded. Both Accessibility & Literacy categories allow for planning (“zero” funding). \$75,000 for Accessibility requested for 2016. Literacy requesting \$85,000 for 2016 - specifically on literacy services. We’ve had a sub category for Early Literacy but that is going away as a separate category. It’s always been included as a target age within the Literacy category. Norton asked about the changing totals that have been requested over the years. Michaelson-Schmidt replied that numbers don’t show the entire story. Variables include the amount allocated, the amounts applied for, etc. Howe added that it’s difficult to give a history within the documents that we share with the Advisory Committee. Norton suggested that the overview document could show both numbers – what was budgeted & what was awarded.

Digital Creation Technology Projects

Claringbole reported on this competitive category. This is the third year for this category and they are suggesting \$125,000. There are several funding levels relating to population. Foley asked why the funding level changes. Do smaller populations receive less money? Claringbole reported that we want to encourage more libraries to apply, so Level One is a way of introducing a library to the concept. Foley respectfully disagrees. Claringbole reported that previously there was only one funding level and smaller libraries were not applying. The split was a way to encourage smaller libraries to apply. Michaelson-Schmidt reported that the DPI has applied these levels for all competitive categories. This was done after researching past applications. A library with a smaller population could certainly apply for a larger grant amount

– they would just need to contact DPI to discuss the library’s options. Foley replied that the funding levels appear to be artificial; staffing is a challenge for small libraries and it takes a lot of time to apply for a grant. DeBacher noted that large libraries are seeing significant cuts to funding / staffing. Foley asked if the funding levels are required at the federal level. DeBacher replied that DPI staff sets the funding levels and would be willing to alter the levels based upon today’s discussion. Falkenberg reported that his system has lots of tiny libraries and they have appreciated the funding limits for larger libraries. Marsh suggested taking out the population served from the equation.

Digitization of Historical Materials

Claringbole reported that this category also has funding levels tied to population. \$40,000 is being requested for 2016. The earlier presentation by Pfothhauer and Morrill referred to projects that have been done by Wisconsin libraries.

Merging Library Systems ILS

DeBacher reported on this non-competitive grant. Until a few years ago, there were two merged ILS systems in the state (one of them was SHARE between Mid Wisconsin & Lakeshores). DPI would like to foster larger areas of a shared ILS resulting in greater resource sharing. Similar amount to last year. Claringbole reported that they had hoped there would be more activity in this category but there wasn’t. Norton asked how we promote these opportunities. DeBacher replied that these grants are promoted through the system directors. Kiefer said there’s a lot of conversation around this. This money is to incentivize this activity. Howe wondered whether library systems are holding off merging because of the System LEAN study. DeBacher wondered if there are systems that have entered into new contracts with a vendor in order not to be forced into a merger. Marsh said that she was not part of the investigation between ESLS & Manitowoc-Calumet. Comments made by Committee members relating to merging the ILS between / among systems indicates worries about staffing reductions. Falkenberg asked whether competitive bidding improves efficiency. Kiefer replied that better pricing comes with scale.

Public Library System Merger (Administrative Costs)

DeBacher reported on this non-competitive category - \$25,000 is being requested. This category addresses the question of who is going to pay for financial / legal / procedural aspects during the transition of merging systems.

Statewide Product or Service

Learning Express Database – Berninger reported that \$100,000 is being requested for Learning Express Library. This is a contract that RL&LL manages.

Learning Express Module – Berninger reported that this is for the computer learning skills product. WiLS does the actual management for this product. Looks to the user as one product; however, we cannot receive the low cost for this product without purchasing access to the Learning Express Library. Marsh wondered what the usage is like. Berninger doesn’t have that

data with her. DeBacher reported that this had been requested in the governor's budget –but it was not funded. That's why it's listed here.

School e-book Project

Berninger reported with assistance from Anderson. Based upon a survey conducted by WiLS, they are requesting an additional \$15,000 in 2016 to create a RFI from vendors about costs / specifications for school districts to collaborate in the purchase of e-books. Kiefer added that this would make it possible for school districts to do real budgeting on this. Currently it's a "hodge podge" on how school districts are addressing e-books – similar to the situation from several years ago that existed among public libraries before the Wisconsin Digital Library.

Lunch Break

DPI Managed Projects

New Library Director Boot Camp

DeBacher reported. This training event started in 2012 with a second boot camp in 2014. \$20,000 is being requested for 2016 because we hope to possibly add a second day.

Youth and Special Services Continuing Education Projects- *New Initiative*

DeBacher reported that the goal of this project is to improve professional development for youth and special services. There are two separate items in one category. The first is a current Pilot Project: a multi-system focus for Continuing Education - \$15,000 in 2015. No questions. The second project centers on community-based Early Childhood Family Engagement - \$10,000 requested. This project offers continued support for public library early literacy efforts established or enhanced by the Growing Wisconsin Readers initiative.

Coding – *New Initiative*

Michaelson-Schmidt reported (Claringbole needed to leave the meeting at noon). This is planned as a multi-year project. \$20,000 for 2016. Norton asked about the similarities between this project and the Digital Creation Technologies category. A general discussion took place on the topic of digital creation.

Library System Revisioning Project: Navigating the Roadmap – *New Initiative*

DeBacher reported. The "roadmap" that the COLAND work group created anticipated funding from the state budget. That was not possible with the current state budget, so we're requesting funding from LSTA funds. For 2015, approximately \$35,000 is being used to hire a project manager. For 2016 \$100,000 is being requested. No questions.

Preliminary Grant Categories for 2016 - Discussion-LSTA Advisory Committee

Sepnafski asked about the minutes from the November meeting. Kiefer mentioned at that meeting that the Agency had been contacted by Coursera. There's been no movement on this since that November meeting. Norton encouraged any and all activities that promote learning within a public library environment. Marsh and Falkenberg had questions on how this discussion will proceed. Falkenberg asked if we wanted to include funding for the DPLA, is

there a chance that we can use some of the money set aside for merging ILS and systems if they do not receive any grant requests? Michaelson-Schmidt asked if we attach funding totals to the grant categories at this meeting. Howe replied that yes, we do put forth totals. No questions or discussion of other categories took place.

Review of LSTA Process for 2016 Guidelines

Howe discussed the LSTA timeline, review process, application form, and rating criteria.

Additional Grant Categories for Consideration (from LSTA committee & public hearing)

Preliminary Grant Categories and Budget Recommendations - Propose & Vote

- Falkenberg moved approval of everything under Category C of the 2016 budget at the funding level indicated- Norton second. The table bellows illustrates the categories voted upon.

C. Library Improvement	
Communications & Planning	15,000
Merging Public Library Systems (admin costs) noncompetitive	25,000
Coding DPI	20,000
Library System Revisioning Project DPI	100,000
Public Library Director Orientation (boot camp) DPI	20,000
Statewide Library Improvement	266,700
School eBook Project DPI	15,000
Youth & Special Services Librarian	117,000

- Motion carried.
- Marsh moved to add the DPLA category – Category A – at proposed funding level (\$50,000). Sepnafski second. Falkenberg asked whether this should be a competitive or non-competitive grant. Kiefer replied that we are unable to indicate this right now – will need to research this. Discussion took place. Motion carried. Arndt abstained.
- Norton moved approval of Section A - Digital Creation Technology at \$120,000 – Marsh second. Motion carried (amount lowered by \$5,000).
- Falkenberg moved to accept proposals in lines 13 through 16 of Category A. Norton second.

RL&LL - Statewide Technology	640,200
RL&LL - WISCAT	455,900
Learning Express Computer Module	16,000
Learning Express License	100,000

- Motion carried.
- Norton moved to accept funding at the proposed amount for the Library Technology Consultant (\$110,600). Poler second. Motion carried.
- Marsh moved to approve the Delivery Project (\$90,000) – Foley second. Motion carried.
- Arndt moved to approve the Digitization of Historical for the listed amount (\$40,000) – Norton second. Motion carried.

- Norton moved to accept lines 10 & 12 in Category A at the levels proposed.
Merging ILS of Public Library Systems noncompetitive (\$75,000)
Library System Technology Projects noncompetitive (\$350,000)
- Hegge second. Motion carried.
- Falkenberg and Sepnafski Abstain.
- Falkenberg moved to accept line 20 (SSP Accessibility - \$ 75,000) in Category B – at level listed. Poler second. Motion carried
- Falkenberg moved to accept line 21 (SSP Literacy - \$85,000) in Category B – at level indicated. Sanderson second. Motion carried.
- Marsh moved to accept Line 22 (YSS Continuing Education - \$25,000). Poler second. Motion carried.
- Category D – LSTA Administration – is a non-voting category.

DeBacher asked if there were any questions – especially for those new to the Committee. He asked Berninger to provide an update on staffing within her team. RL&LL now has a total of four positions open at the moment.

Final Comments

Kiefer closed the meeting by thanking everyone again. He also asked for feedback on the LSTA process. DeBacher thanked everyone and reminded everyone how much this Committee helps the LSTA grant process. The Committee members will be involved in the process of updating the LSTA guidelines. Also, we need your help in finding grant reviewers. Thanks to Jamie McCanless for automating so much of the grant process. Howe said that the Committee members will be receiving updates on the changes for the application process.

Howe will send mileage reimbursement forms to the Committee members.

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 10, 2015

Meeting Adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

Recorded by Denise Anton Wright with assistance from Ryan Claringbole and Terrie Howe